

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 12-15, 17, and 19-21 are in the case. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, and 15 in this application. The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the present case. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations or divisional patent applications.

### Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to a typographical error in claim 1 that included a period at the end of the limitation beginning with “selecting and action ID”. Applicants have amended claim 1 to repair the typographical error. As such, the objection should be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 Over Trossen

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 12-15, 17, and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Trossen, *et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0204599) (hereafter ‘Trossen’). “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Trossen does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, and Trossen therefore does not anticipate the claims of the present application within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent claim 1 claims a method for administering devices implemented with two data processing domains that includes among other elements “a domain state object, the domain state object comprising . . . information describing a user’s current condition within the first domain.” To facilitate expedition prosecution applicants have amended

claim 1 to recite “wherein the user is a human being.” That is, claim 1 claims a domain state object that includes information describing a human being’s current condition within the first domain. Furthermore, claim 1 also includes executing an action in the second domain that is identified in dependence upon that domain state object that includes information describing the human being’s current condition. As described in Applicants’ specification, such actions control devices and their execution control devices that may affect the user’s condition in the second domain.

In stark contrast to claim 1, Trossen describes an application context which permits transfer of application functionality across administrative service domains. Trossen is directed to restoring an application in a second domain that was running on a mobile terminal in a first domain. Trossen’s application context is directed to restoring capabilities of the computer application only and therefore contains no information describing any human being’s current condition and therefore is not used to administer devices as claimed in claim 1. As such, Trossen does not disclose each and every element of claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate claim 1. As such, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claim should be allowed.

### **Relations Among Claims**

Independent claims 8 and 15 are system and computer program product claims for administering devices corresponding to independent method claim 1 that include “means for” and “means, recorded on a recording medium, for” administering devices. For the same reason that Trossen does not disclose a method for administering devices, Trossen also does not disclose systems and computer program products for administering devices corresponding to independent claims 8 and 15. Independent claims 8 and 15 are therefore patentable and should be allowed.

Claims 3, 5-7, 10, 11, 12-14, 17, and 19-21 depend respectively from independent claims 1, 8, and 15. Each dependent claim includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which it depends. Because Trossen does not disclose each and every element

of the independent claims, Trossen does not disclose each and every element of the dependent claims of the present application. As such, claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are also patentable and should be allowed.

### Conclusion

Claim 1 has been amended to cure the typographical error objected to in the Office Action and to facilitate expeditious prosecution in this case. Each and every element of amended claim 1 is not disclosed by Trossen and Trossen therefore does not anticipate the claims of the present application within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the present amendments and remarks this case is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request allowance of claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 12-15, 17, and 19-21.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0447 for any fees required or overpaid.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 4, 2008

By:

H. Artoush Ohanian  
Reg. No. 46,022  
Biggers & Ohanian, LLP  
P.O. Box 1469  
Austin, Texas 78767-1469  
Tel. (512) 472-9881  
Fax (512) 472-9887  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS